

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-29 remain pending in the application. Of these, claims 1, 10 and 20 are independent. Claims 1, 10, 13-20 and 26-29 are sought to be amended. The specification is also sought to be amended. Applicant believes that these changes introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: reference numeral 160. The specification has been amended to refer to reference number 160 (and not the incorrect reference number 170). The specification has also been amended to properly refer to reference number 170. Approval and entry of these proposed amendments are respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 13-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2004/0255326 A1 ("Hicks") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,780 B1 ("Kasriel"). Claims 10-12, 20-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hicks in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,281,790 B1 ("Kimmel") and in further view of Kasriel. Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hicks in view of Kasriel and further in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0028208 A1 ("Ellis"). Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hicks in view of Kimmel and Kasriel and further

in view of Ellis. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to claims 1-29 since Hicks, Kasriel, Kimmel and Ellis, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 1, 10 and 20 for at least the following reason. Claims 1, 10 and 20 have been amended to further define the enhanced content data feature to include triggers and announcements to synchronize the digital broadcast signal content with content on a display. Support for this may be found in the specification on page 5, lines 24-26. None of Hicks, Kasriel, Kimmel or Ellis, either taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the enhanced content data feature as claimed. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 10 and 20 (and their dependent claims 2-9, 11-19 and 21-29) are patentable over Hicks, Kasriel, Kimmel and Ellis, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Intel Corporation

Dated: January 19, 2006

/Molly A. McCall/ Reg. No. 46,126
Molly A. McCall
(703) 633-3311

P9902 reply to non-final

<p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450</p> <p>On: <u>January 19, 2006</u></p> <p>Signature:  Katherine Jennings</p>
--